

## **FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD**

### **MINUTES**

March 28, 2001

The monthly meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board was called to order by Chairman Patel at 3:35 p.m. on Wednesday, March 28, 2001.

**Board Members Present:** Hemant Patel, Chairman; Shirley Long, Vice Chair; Mike Saager, Secretary; Melvin Martin; Scott Ward; Ray Dovalina (for Tom Callow, Ex Officio); Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio.

**Staff Members Present:** Mike Ellegood, Chief Engineer and General Manager; Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Tom Johnson, Deputy Chief Engineer; Dick Perreault, CIP/Policy Branch Manager; Russ Miracle, Planning Branch Manager; Steve Waters, Flood Warning/Data Collection Branch Manager; Michael Alexander, Management Analyst; Joe Young, Chief Financial Officer; Lynn Thomas, Floodplain Management Branch Manager; Shanna Yager, Floodplain Administration Branch Manager; Todd Williams, Water Quality Program Coordinator; Kathy Smith, Clerk of the FCAB; Monica Ortiz, Administrative Coordinator.

**Guests Present:** Paul Kinshella, City of Phoenix; Mary Dahl, La Paz County; Ron Fletcher, Arlington School; Ed Fritz, MCDOT; Teri George, DEA; Terri Leija, Board of Supervisors; Gibson McKay, High Ground; L. Steve Miller, DEC; Tim Morrison, HDR Engineering.

1) **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 23, 2001**

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Cherrington and seconded by Mr. Martin to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

2) **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2001**

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3) **CAVE CREEK DAM RESERVOIR**

Russ Miracle, Planning Branch Manager, presented IGA FCD 99013, which was continued from the February 28 FCAB meeting. This IGA allows the City of Phoenix to discharge treated effluent into the Cave Creek Dam Reservoir.

The IGA addresses the potential impacts to the District by the discharge of the water into the District's facility. If sediment is washed into the flood reservoir, it will need to be removed to maintain the flood capacity of the Cave Buttes Dam. The City of Phoenix has been working with the District to mitigate the potential impact to the reservoir. The purpose of the IGA is to assure that the District is not adversely impacted by the discharge.

Mr. Paul Kinshella, Superintendent of Wastewater, City of Phoenix, was invited to address the Board on the impact of the discharge and the water quality of the effluent. Mr. Kinshella explained that the reclaimed water, as defined through the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Reuse Standards, is classified as A+ water, meaning that it is filtered to the point where you can't detect fecal coliforms, no virus, and no nitrogen less than 10 ppb. The City of Phoenix has a permit from EPA Region 9 and also a NPDES Permit to operate the wastewater treatment plant. It is a requirement that NPDES Permit address any discharges that might be made to the environment, and the discharge does qualify under that. The discharge also has an Aquifer Protection Permit to protect the quality of the groundwater.

Staff recommends that the Flood Control Advisory Board approve and recommend that the Board of Directors approve IGA FCD 99013, which allows the City of Phoenix to discharge treated effluent into the Cave Creek Dam Reservoir.

Discussion:

*Cherrington:* You already have the NPDES Permit?

*Kinshella:* Yes.

*Long:* How many wells are in the area?

*Kinshella:* Within a mile, there is only one well and it's on the other side of the mountain. It will have some hydrologic connection to our discharge. Right now the Aquifer Protection Permit states that as long as we have an annual average discharge of less than 250,000 gallons a day, we do not have to put in a larger well. Part of the agreement addresses us being able to put in a monitoring well on Flood Control District property. We do not believe we are going to have a hydrologic or quality impact on the surrounding wells, but we will be monitoring them to insure that we don't. There are several other wells that will not be impacted. The purpose of the Aquifer Protection Permit is to protect the quality of the wells, especially those used for drinking water. The Aquifer Protection Permit states that by the time any water reaches the groundwater, it has to be drinking water standard. We expect that our water quality will be drinking water standard when it comes out of the plant.

*Long:* Another question we had from last meeting was how the effluent is treated?

*Konshella:* ADEQ grades water at C, B, B+, A, and A+. B means it is a secondary effluent, B+ means that you remove the nitrogen to below 10 ppb. A means that you filter the water, removing any virus & bacteria from the water to detectable levels.

*Ellegood:* Our own NPDES Specialist, Todd Williams, is in the audience and if there are questions specific to the NPDES permits he will be able to answer them.

*Long:* Regarding the IGA, Item 7 concerns me. One of the key issues to all of us is water quality and the integrity of the entity that is doing the monitoring. Why would the City of Phoenix delegate to someone else? If the City of Phoenix decides to delegate to another authority, it should require that the Flood Control District be in concurrence with that.

*Kinshella:* I don't believe our intention is to delegate to someone else. I think that what this has to do with is to say that if we, at some point in the future, decide to privatize the operation from our plant (which would be a City Council action), we could delegate that at that point. Per discussions we are having with our operations staff and our union at this point, we are not looking at privatizing any of our facilities. We do all our own monitoring. We have probably one of the best laboratories in the State as far as water quality testing.

*Long:* So the City of Phoenix would not delegate to anyone outside – you would always be monitoring?

*Kinshella:* That's the way we are operating right now.

*Lemmon:* Paragraph 7 is part of what I call our Intergovernmental Agreement boilerplate. We put that in so that if somebody chooses to hire a contractor to fulfill part of their responsibilities, they can hire somebody. But, the second sentence states that even if they hire someone else they are still on the hook for fulfilling their duties. Even if they put their testing out with a contractor, the City of Phoenix is still going to be responsible if their contractor doesn't do a good job. I think in this case, since it would require us to mutually agree to it anyway, we are pretty well protected.

*Kinshella:* One part of this agreement that we are delegating is that it requires us to do studies on sediment transport down the Wash to the impound of Cave Creek Dam. We do have that under contract to a consultant that the Flood Control District helped us select.

*Cherrington:* Where are the recharge systems you mentioned?

*Kinshella:* Part of the study we are doing is for the multi-use area behind the dam. Part of what we are looking at is if there are suitable sites for recharge. We're also going to look down at the Cave Creek plant site for recharge. Our method has not been determined at this time.

*Cherrington:* Are you looking for recharge credits for that?

*Kinshella:* Yes.

*Cherrington:* What's in it for the District?

*Ellegood:* I understand they have the authority to discharge anyway.

*Cherrington:* Why is this coming to us then?

*Ellegood:* By the City of Phoenix coming to the District and asking for us to review and approve their plan, I think it reduces risk on the part of both government agencies.

*Cherrington:* I realize it's a different situation, but I'm sure that Mr. Kinshella will say that they have a right to do it because they've applied for and received an NPDES Permit. I could also apply for and probably get, at least through the Environmental Protection Agency, a permit to discharge similar water into our system upstream of their water treatment plant. I suspect we'd be having a long discussion about that. I appreciate your coming, Paul, and I'm sure you've done all the due diligence, but this is scary stuff.

*Kinshella:* When we were talking to the Flood Control District about this, a lot of their concerns centered around what they operate, which is the flood control structure and a storage pool above that structure and sediment that we might transport into that structure, or water that we may have in their impound that would impact the effectiveness of that structure. A lot of what this agreement is about is making the Flood Control District whole relative to what they operate. They operate the dam for flood protection down stream and we do not want to cause any additional flooding down stream.

*Martin:* Is our staff expert in agreement with the City staff?

*Williams:* With regards to this project, I have reviewed the permit that was issued by EPA to the City of Phoenix. It is actually a tiered permit where, if in the event any water did go down as far as the dam, it would trigger additional requirements in terms of what testing will be involved. I am very comfortable with the permit that is in place; basically they do have a tiered approach that will deal with any water quality issues that there are, including toxicity testing. With regards to the ground water, the Aquifer Protection Permit will address those issues. Due to the permits that are placed through EPA as well as the State, I think we are covered.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Ms. Long to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

4) COOPERATIVE EFFORT WITH LA PAZ COUNTY – CENTENNIAL WASH

Russ Miracle, Planning Branch Manager, presented Resolution FCD 2001R002, which authorizes the District to cooperate with La Paz County, and others, to define a watershed based solution to the flooding problems along the Centennial Wash.

La Paz County came to the District and proposed that anything the District might plan for the portion of the watershed in Maricopa County may impact La Paz County and that a coordinated watershed-wide master plan would be a better approach.

Steve Waters, Flood Warning/Data Collection Branch Manager, presented hydrometeorological information on the flooding that occurred last October as well as some of the ground information on flooding that occurred.

Russ Miracle gave a brief update on the FEMA Grant – the process and criteria the District went through. Those that were eligible were the publicly owned special districts and the Flood Control District qualified for and received a grant. The conditions are that the federal government pays 75% and the District pays 25%. The District forwarded a Resolution to the Board of Directors for approval, which gave us the authority to pursue the grant. The total amount requested was approximately \$977,000. The purpose of the grant was for acquisition of properties that were flood prone within the Aguila area.

Mr. Miracle indicated that La Paz County has passed a Resolution (No. 00-27) calling for a cooperative effort in solving the flood problems within that watershed. At the same time and in response to these floods, the District has programmed floodplain delineation and planning funding, which is included in next year's budget. The Resolution authorizes the District to continue with those floodplain delineation and planning studies programmed, to acquire the rights of entry, to conduct the studies, and to initiate IGA's with La Paz County and others to conduct a coordinated, watershed-wide effort to arrive at a watershed mitigation plan.

Staff recommends that the Flood Control Advisory Board approve and recommend that Board of Directors approve Resolution FCD 2001R002.

Discussion:

*Martin:* Is our part of the cost 25% of the \$977,000?

*Ellegood:* The total cost of damage to the Aguila area was determined to be \$977,000. The federal government will pay 75% and the District will pay 25%. What we are asking action on is to enter into this cooperative agreement with La Paz County to do a better floodplain delineation than is presently in place.

*Long:* At the cost of roughly a million dollars for the study alone?

*Miracle:* The million dollars is for the proposed studies for next year.

*Long:* And that strictly comes from Flood Control?

*Ellegood:* This is the Maricopa County portion of the study. La Paz County has another piece of it – I've heard \$1.5 million.

*Miracle:* We are currently putting together the estimate. The \$1 million is the study of only the watershed and the flooded areas within Maricopa County.

*Long:* What hasn't been determined by the aerial photographs? We can see that it's flooded; now you need to study the flood?

*Miracle:* We know what the problems are, now we need to work on the fix.

*Long:* What is the percentage of the floodplain in Maricopa County? How often do we go outside of Maricopa County to assist others? Isn't there a small percentage in Maricopa County?

*Miracle:* The proposal in the Resolution authorizes us to proceed only with work within Maricopa County. If we can work out an IGA with La Paz County and La Paz County has adequate funding, we can expand that study, but we will not expend Maricopa County taxpayer funds for work to be conducted in La Paz County. La Paz County would reimburse all costs to expand the study.

*Long:* So if La Paz says they don't have the money for the study, what happens?

*Miracle:* We do the portion of the watershed within Maricopa County.

*Long:* How often do we go outside of Maricopa County with IGA's? And, are we setting precedent with this particular issue?

*Lemmon:* This isn't a precedent, in fact, if you look in the Statutes you would see that it says that you can actually spend money and buy land outside of the county as long as it is for the benefit of your county. Russ's comment that he can't do anything outside the County that doesn't directly benefit Maricopa County is correct.

*Long:* I think what we are gasping about is the cost for this study.

*Miracle:* The proposed study in the Aguila area is to expand the floodplain delineations that currently exist because they don't cover the whole area and is an effort to prevent more development in bad places. The other portion of the study is to identify a plan to fix some of the problems that exist out there. Water is overtopping the railroad and highway from the north and flows into town.

*Martin:* Why wouldn't the railroad people and ADOT with the road situation be involved with this study also? They are part of the problem.

*Ellegood:* You are right, they are part of the problem. Clearly a task is going to be to convince ADOT that they should do something like replace the bridge – that has washed out twice now – with a bigger bridge. I suspect that when the time comes to implement a plan, they'll be responsible for building that bridge. I think we do need to work up the data and the plan that will show them what to do.

*Patel:* For a million dollars, what is the benefit since it is a small community. When we talk about expending a million dollars in more urbanized areas, we always look at taking so many homes out of a floodplain and the amount of property value that gets affected. Have you done a cost benefit analysis here and what are we looking at?

*Miracle:* We haven't done the studies so I can't give you the results.

*Patel:* Where is the money coming from? Do we have the \$1 million programmed in our CIP?

*Ellegood:* It is part of our planning study. Back four years ago I charged Russ Miracle with developing a plan that would develop a watershed and watercourse master plan for every watershed and every watercourse within Maricopa County. This was an effort to better define where the flood hazards are and then, using our regulatory powers, keep people out of harms way. I cannot over-emphasize that these flood maps that we've used were constructed with varying degrees of sophistication. Ranging from a grease pencil on a USGS map to something very detailed. In this particular case, the floodplain is not adequately or completely mapped. The area up there, although still quite rural, is developing. What we are asking to do is work cooperatively with La Paz County so that there is a comprehensive watershed or watercourse-wide plan and strategy for identifying the hazard and managing the hazard.

*Long:* What is La Paz County putting up, money-wise right now?

*Miracle:* La Paz County and others would put up the cost to do whatever study is needed for the La Paz County portion of the watershed. Our plan right now is to stop our study effort at the Maricopa County line.

*Patel:* What would that achieve if La Paz and Yavapai Counties don't have the funding, should we proceed? It wouldn't be a complete picture and would that really give you the value you need?

*Miracle:* We feel comfortable spending Maricopa County taxpayer funds to study issues that would benefit Maricopa County residents. So, there is an argument that we could do some study

of the Centennial Wash Watershed because it does return to Maricopa County in the lower reach. But on advice from counsel, we'll be very careful that what we do is clearly of benefit to Maricopa County.

*Patel:* Should you even embark on the project or just wait until La Paz and the others have the money? In other words, should we authorize you to have our budget available, but not embark on the study and create a partial picture that doesn't really give you all the data you need?

*Miracle:* Our recommendation is to proceed with the Maricopa County portion of the study in the upper watershed, primarily because Maricopa County property is in the very upper portion of the watershed. If we proceed without participation of La Paz County and others, then we would work diligently to make sure that they were a part of our study and had input and comment on our proposed plans.

*Cherrington:* Isn't Yavapai County involved?

*Miracle:* Yavapai County is involved – they attended some early meetings. Their involvement is that a portion of the upper watershed is located within Yavapai County.

*Cherrington:* Where is La Paz County on the issues? You mentioned that someone is here from La Paz County.

*Mary Dahl, Director of Community Development/Emergency Management Director, La Paz County:* If commitment were dollars, we would be there because La Paz County and the Board of Supervisors is 100% committed to finding a way for us to have a regional study of the Centennial Wash Watershed. During the course of the response to the flooding in Wenden, one of the hardest things for me was looking at those people who said 'when are you going to clean out the Wash, what are you going to do with the Wash?' The whole system needs to be looked at and the whole watershed needs to be studied. From the very start, we've been saying that we need to look at the entire watershed. The watershed begins in Yavapai, comes through Maricopa, and takes that through La Paz County and back into Maricopa County. That is why the Division of Emergency Management has been heading up this cooperative approach and trying to help us find the resources that we need to cover our side of the line. Our Board passed a Resolution early on saying there are a lot of players here that need to step up, including the City of Phoenix. The City of Phoenix owns a great deal of land in La Paz County as well as the Railroad, ADOT, MCDOT, and others need to be part of this overall study.

*Martin:* How did you determine that the study is going to cost \$1 million?

*Miracle:* It's kind of a rough estimate on our part. We haven't negotiated the scope with the consultant at this point. It's purely based on previous studies that we've done and contracts that we've issued based on so many dollars per linear mile per various things.

*Martin:* Wouldn't it be better off to have the area flown and do a Topo on it that way?

*Ellegood:* We are, in fact, doing that. We are arranging to fly much of Maricopa County for this purpose and the intent was to fly this portion of it early, which would reduce that cost significantly from the \$1 million.

*Cherrington:* When you fly, though, you're not going to draw a line on the ground and just fly that portion in Maricopa – you're going to fly the watershed aren't you?

*Ellegood:* That is correct and that is one reason why this cooperative effort would make sense. I don't think the portion of the watershed in Yavapai County affects any real property, it's all state land and possible federal land, so we would end up paying for that anyway.

*Cherrington:* Is it inappropriate to approve this contingent upon getting agreements with La Paz County?

*Ellegood:* If that is the wish of this Board, then certainly. We still feel that the issues up there are significant enough that even without La Paz County participation, we should do what we can in Maricopa County in the upper reaches.

*Patel:* Then we would be breaking the study up. We would be showing our commitment if we authorize our portion of the expenditures, contingent upon all the other players. One study would be more beneficial.

*Cherrington:* Do you have any positive head counts from the Department of Emergency Management?

*Dahl:* We're looking at a lot of different possibilities, including the Governor's emergency fund. There are a lot of things up in the air this time of year, so we don't have any idea.

*Miracle:* My recommendation would be to at least proceed with the mapping for floodplain delineations.

*Patel:* Even if the other players were at the table, would you not do it for the whole area and split the cost?

*Miracle:* What we need to do the study in Maricopa County is some very detailed mapping that extends this floodplain to the east. The mapping that Mike is talking about is approximate contour mapping and is not accurate enough for us to do floodplain delineations with. We would proceed with that mapping so that we could at least identify the floodplain to the east of town. In summary, the Resolution authorizes us not only to conduct the studies, which are in our next year's budget, but also to negotiate and pursue IGA's with La Paz County and others.

*Martin:* I think it's a worth-while project, but it's hard to sit here and say we are going to spend \$1 million to study the problem and not curing the problem. If you were curing it, I'd be pounding the table, but all we're going to do is study it for \$1 million. I'm concerned about the cost.

*Cherrington:* I think that if you are flying it to get the Topo, it doesn't make sense not to fly the entire watershed or the whole drainage area. I think you should focus on the planning in the upper end and negotiate with others for the entire thing and in that negotiation, recoup what you have done for them in the flying, etc., but keep your planning efforts until they join on the upper end.

*Ward:* I agree with that analysis. Have we looked at damming Centennial Wash?

*Ellegood:* We have not. There was a dam at Narrows that failed in 1997. That dam and all vestiges of it have been removed. We are not currently considering a plan to dam Centennial Wash and won't consider that until it becomes part of a plan to deal with that watershed.

*Miracle:* That is why my recommendation is that we proceed with the floodplain delineations to the east so that we can notify people of where the floodplain exists.

*Patel:* I think there is some concern by the Board to move ahead with just our piece. We will be doing more than our share as an interested party on this project by committing the money. I understand the need is now, but you are probably going to wind up costing Maricopa County more by trying to go it on your own with just your piece and then trying to integrate the other pieces as their funding comes alive. It's a regional problem; we're doing our piece by saying we'll come to the table with \$1 million and then hopefully our other partners are successful in their endeavors. A million dollars is still a heck of a price tag, but we'll approve that funding, but let's not just go barging off a doing things on our own.

*Cherrington:* The only concern I have with that is if the Centennial Wash didn't wind back into Maricopa County, we'd be protecting those people in Aguila and that's really what you're asking us to do. There is going to be some additional costs when it comes back if they join the study.

*Patel:* Wouldn't it be necessary to study the portion of the watershed in Yavapai County?

*Cherrington:* You have to fly all that to know what you're getting, right?

*Miracle:* I agree, there are some economies of scale. I would caution, however, should La Paz County not get funding, then I would encourage us not to put off forever providing the service for the Maricopa County portion of the study.

*Patel:* Then let's go through our normal CIP process. Since we're recognizing this as a regional project, let's bring our share to the table and help the other partners in any way we can so they can secure funding.

*Miracle:* That was the intent of the Resolution to offer that we are planning to do these things the Resolution will authorize us to pursue IGA's in a cooperative watershed.

*Patel:* That part is fine, I would just say let's hold off on actually hiring the consultants and doing our one-third piece.

*Ward:* Mike, have we talked with BLM? Have we talked with the Army Corps of Engineers of helping with this project?

*Ellegood:* I have discussed this with the Army Corps of Engineers. They would be interested in a study, but their process would take about five years to get through and probably the local cost share would be almost as much as we are talking about. I think the time is now to study this and this is an opportunity to gain the economies of scale. I'd be very happy to go along with what I think I heard Mr. Cherrington suggest, which is that we put our money on the table and say it's there, we'll spend it if you join us. If La Paz County is unable to come up with their resources in order to fund their part of it, then we come back to this Board and say 'well, this didn't happen, but we need to do something else.'

*Patel:* Can we have a motion to that effect.

*Saager:* Mike, did you ever get in touch with Tim Bray? This received a lot of national attention and Tim Bray is extremely close with Bruce Babbitt. I would say I don't know what they can do or not do. I know there was federal funding for the flooding event. Can't we look at this, he's real close with the people I know in La Paz County and see what's available or not available. It would just take a phone call. It seems to me that we should explore a couple more options before putting that kind of money on the table. I think that's better than sitting there waiting for La Paz County to tip their hand and say 'yes, we can maybe get some money.'

*Cherrington:* How long will it be before we hear from them? I was invited when Wenden got flooded to go as a volunteer and help them. I wouldn't want to leave them hanging out very long – it's a mess.

*Ward:* What is the population of Salome, Wenden, and Aguila?

*Ellegood:* I'm not certain.

*Ward:* Do they have all-weather crossings to hospitals and police?

*Ellegood:* No. Following the storm event, I flew that area and much of Aguila was under water and all of Wenden was under water. It looked like Highway 60 went down into a river and then up the other side with little houses sticking up through it. It was a mess.

*Dahl:* We estimate about 500 in Wenden and close to 1,000 in Salome.

*Joe Munoz:* It varies because those are migratory-type folks that come in to work at the ranch. You might have 500 – 1,000 people, but in season you could have up to 3,000 people living in that area.

*Patel:* I take it we want to follow through on contacting Mr. Bray?

*Ellegood:* Yes, we will.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Cherrington and seconded by Ms. Long to approve the funding for the study contingent on if La Paz County comes up with their portion of the funding. If La Paz County does not come up with funding in 90 days, the Advisory Board will revisit the issue. The motion carried unanimously.

Further Discussion:

*Lemmon:* I want to make sure I have my notes right because we'll need to amend the Resolution appropriately.

*Patel:* The motion was to grant what staff is asking for except that we are committing the funds but not proceeding with any study on our own and waiting until the other partners are able to secure funds.

*Ellegood:* It's subject to La Paz County finding funds to meet their portion of it.

*Patel:* So we can do one study that covers the whole watershed.

*Lemmon:* So you are not authorizing them to go forward at this time?

*Martin:* Provided that La Paz comes up with their share. Someone is going to have to tell them what their share is.

*Ward:* Do we put a time frame on this? Do we want to revisit this if La Paz County says they don't have any money?

*Ellegood:* Does 60 days work for La Paz?

*Dahl:* I think until the end of the fiscal year.

*Ellegood:* I know La Paz is in discussions with the State Emergency Management and it looks like the end of the fiscal year is a reasonable number, so I suggest a period of 90 days, which is the end of the fiscal year.

*Patel:* If there are no funds at that time, let's revisit it.

*Martin:* I'd like to have some accurate figures of what it would cost to fly the watershed.

## 5) ARLINGTON SCHOOL PROJECT

Mike Ellegood presented Resolution FCD 2001R007 in order to be given authority to negotiate an IGA with the Arlington School District and any other agencies that may be appropriate to acquire the Arlington School, demolish the damaged structure and facilitate relocation of the school out of the floodplain.

Mr. Ellegood showed that the property is in a floodway, has been repetitively flooded, and should not be rebuilt. The School Board has approved 4-0 to proceed with obtaining money to move the school. The school has found 20 acres of land for a new location. Mr. Ellegood had an appraisal from a certified appraiser that states the depreciated value of the school is \$1.2 million.

Mr. Ellegood asked Ron Fletcher, the School Superintendent, to address the Board. Mr. Fletcher needs about \$3 million to build a new school. He expects to get \$1.2 million through some combination of District and FEMA dollars, a little over \$0.5 million from the State Facilities Board, and about \$350,000 in fire insurance money. Mr. Ellegood mentioned that what triggered this was that there was a fire in the school on November 3, which created damage in one of the wings of the school greater than 50%. Under the Flood Control District's Floodplain Regulations, the District cannot permit the school to be rebuilt. The District has looked at other alternatives – floodproofing, elevating the structure, etc. – and all are impractical. Mr. Ellegood asked for permission to pursue this as a project and to pursue the FEMA money and then come back to this Board in 30-60 days with a recommendation.

### Discussion:

*Cherrington:* You already received FEMA dollars for damage.

*Fletcher:* That was in the past. We've actually had four floods in that school.

*Cherrington:* FEMA does allow for buying stuff out of floodplains?

*Ellegood:* Yes, this fits very neatly into a FEMA repetitive loss buyout program. There are some technical issues that we are dealing with.

*Ward:* Mr. Fletcher, have you met with Lisa Graham Keegan?

*Fletcher:* No, I have not. I met with the State Facilities Board to discuss this issue.

*Ward:* And they proposed \$600,000 in help?

*Fletcher:* What they said is that they will not fund the whole operation. They said if I go to Flood Control and you guys anti up your share of about ¾ of the school that is still usable, then they will come in and supply the rest of the money to build us a school along with our insurance money.

*Ward:* How many students are enrolled in the school?

*Fletcher:* About 203 students.

*Ward:* What school district is it?

*Fletcher:* Arlington School District.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

10) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There was no other business or comments from the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. by general consent.

---

Mike Saager  
Secretary of the Board

---

Kathy Smith  
Clerk of the Board